

*Synonyms.*Trifurcula . . . . . *pallidella*.

immundella . . . . pulverella, Bentley.

Tischeria . . . . . complanella . . . . . rufipennis, Haw.; rufipennella, St.; fulvescens, St.

*Ricciardella*.

Emyella . . . . . marginea, Haw., St.

*gaunacella*.*angusticollella*.XXXI. *On the Synonyms of Tinea festaliella of Hübner.*  
By H. T. STAINTON, Esq.

[Read 6th November, 1848.]

FEW insects have ever had a more perplexed synonymy than this; in this country it has been successively referred to two other Hübnerian species; and in France, Duponchel has figured another insect as *festaliella*, whereas he figures the true *festaliella* as a new species. The synonyms of this insect are as follows:—

*Tinea festaliella*, Hübner, 449.*Ecophora festaliella*, Treitschke, 10, 3, 213, (non Dup.)*Elachista festaliella*, Zeller, Isis, 1839, s. 212, 17.*Elachista festaliella*, Lienig, Isis, 1846, s. 299.*Tinea scissella*, Haworth, Lep. Brit. 580, 69, (non Hüb.)*N. G. scissella*, Stephens's Cat. 7382.*Chrysocorys scissella*, Curtis, Brit. Ent. vol. xiv. pl. 663.*Chrysocorys angustipennella*, Stephens's Illust. 4, 282, (non Hüb.)*Chrysocorys angustipennella*, Wood, f. 1402.*Elachista Montandonella*, Duponchel, XI. 553, pl. 309, f. 11.

The origin of all this confusion probably arises from the fact of Hübner's figure not being a good one; yet the insect certainly agrees far better with his figure than with that of *scissella*, No. 270, and this was remarked by Mr. Curtis.

Treitschke's description is not good; indeed, Zeller says of it, "unkennbar beschrieben" (Isis, 1839, s. 212, 17); but there is sufficient character about it to recognize the insect.

Zeller's description, though very short, is precise, and leaves no doubt upon the mind of the species he intended.

Madame Lienig does not describe the insect, she merely records its occurrence.

Haworth describes the insect efficiently, but errs in referring it to Hübner's *scissella*. The *scissella* of Hübner is not known to recent continental writers; but, judging from his figure, the anterior wings are narrower than in *festaliella*, and, instead of having two dark lines from the base to the hinder margin, there is but one, which becomes furcate when it approaches the hinder margin, not much unlike the insect figured by Duponchel as *festaliella*.

In Mr. Stephens's Catalogue we again meet with the insect under the name of *scissella*, Hübner being referred to without any doubt, and below is given, as a synonyme, "*Ti. angustipennella*—?"

In Mr. Curtis's work appears a correct description and figure of the insect; and he there boldly asserts that it is not the *scissella* of Hübner, but either a species closely allied to *festaliella* of Hübner, or that insect itself.

We now come to Mr. Stephens's Illustrations, where the insect first assumes the name of *angustipennella* (by which name it is most generally known to the rising generation of English entomologists); but here it is not called *angustipennella*, Hübner, but is thus given: "*N. G. angustipennella*, Steph. Cat. 2, 211, N. 7382, *Schreckensteinia*, Hübner?" but, as before noticed, *angustipennella* is given in the Catalogue without any authority; therefore *angustipennella* must evidently be considered as *angustipennella*, Stephens. In the Appendix to the Illustrations, 4, 423, this insect is given twice; once rightly, as *Schreckensteinia festaliella*, N. 4083; and again incorrectly, as *Cosmopteryx angustipennella*, N. 4128; but this Mr. Stephens appears to have been doubtful about, as he places a note of interrogation to it.

The true *Cosmopteryx angustipennella*, Hübner, (*Tinea pedella*, L.) is an insect allied to *Gracillaria præangusta*, Haw., (*Turdi-pennella*, Tr.) and frequenting alders; I am not aware that it has occurred in this country.

The insect figured by Duponchel he received from Fischer von Roslertamm, who states that "it flies in great numbers in May on the flowers of *Sambucus racemosa*, and Mann has taken single specimens around pine trees:" this certainly does not appear applicable to our species. Duponchel's description is extremely vague, and his figure does not represent our insect, neither am I acquainted with the species for which it is intended. The figure given by Duponchel of *Montandonella* correctly represents this species, but the description is slightly deficient.